

REMARKS

Applicants acknowledge receipt of the Final Office Action dated September 8, 2008 and the Advisory Action dated December 1, 2008. The Final Office Action rejected Claims 1, 3-11, and 13-24 under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,000,000 issued to Hawkins et al. (Hawkins) in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2006/0112150 filed by Brown et al. (Brown). The Advisory Action, however, indicates that dependent Claims 4 and 12 are allowable subject matter. In light of the following remarks, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner's reconsideration and reexamination of all pending claims.

Applicants are grateful for the acknowledgement in the Advisory Action that dependent Claims 4 and 12 are allowable. However, the Final Office Action expressly rejects dependent Claim 4 on page 3 thereof and cites portions of Hawkins in support. Specifically, the page 3 rejection indicates that limitations of Claim 4 can be found in Hawkins' Figure 4; Figure 6; column 3, lines 3 – 9 column 4, lines 26 – 45, and; column 7, line 25 – column 8, line 14. Applicants previously asked whether dependent Claim 2 was allowable since it was not expressly rejected. Applicants request clarification as to whether Claim 2 or Claim 4, or both, are allowable subject matter.

Applicants previously argued the Final Office Action did not argue the combination of Hawkins and Brown teach independent Claim 1's limitation of "causing the server to perform a transaction on the database based on the transaction information." Because of this, Applicants previously argued the Final Office Action failed to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness in rejecting independent Claim 1. Independent Claim 11 recites a similar limitation, and Applicants previously argued the Final Office Action

failed to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness in rejecting independent Claim 11 since the Final Office Action did not allege this limitation is taught in the combination of Hawkins and Brown. The Advisory Action does not address these arguments. The Advisory Action, however, includes a blank third page. Perhaps this third page was to contain the Examiner's response to Applicants argument that the Final Office Action failed to provide a *prima facie* case of obviousness, and the response was inadvertently left off? At any rate, Applicants wish to bring this oversight to the attention of the Examiner.

CONCLUSION

In view of the amendments and remarks set forth herein, the application and the claims therein are believed to be in condition for allowance without any further examination and a notice to that effect is solicited. Nonetheless, should any issues remain that might be subject to resolution through a telephonic interview, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned.

If any extensions of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a) are required in order for this submission to be considered timely, Applicant hereby petitions for such extensions. Applicant also hereby authorizes that any fees due for such extensions or any other fee associated with this submission, as specified in 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or § 1.17, be charged to Deposit Account 502306.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Eric A. Stephenson', with a stylized flourish at the end.

Eric A. Stephenson  
Attorney for Applicants  
Reg. No. 38,321  
Telephone: (512) 439-5093  
Facsimile: (512) 439-5099